Dear Jim, Re: C.A.75-226, depositions an curbstone 6.2.77

With a special admonition to our scholar/lawyer-to-be that he hit the books again.

While awaiting the head of the Hood history dept. I went over the typescript of the Tague deposition rather than the printed version. Sure enough Liebeler made his changes. But they are not the central point in this.

The cubbstone appears to have been patched by May 1964 and Liebeler knew it. In fact one can infer that he knew it before seeking confirmation from Tague and then sought to obfuscate after getting the confirmation by misleating Tague, a Liebeler specialty. As with Altgens.

Tague took movies to take and show to his in-laws in Indianapolis. Liebeler does not go into it but Tague told me they suddenly disappeared.

Tague was surprised that Liebeler knew he took pictures. He said he did not know that anyone knew.

Liebeler asked him if he could still see the mark in May and Tague said not.

I have made notes with direct quotes.

Now you know why the FBI could not or pretended it could not find the mark.

Why the pictures are so unclear when much clearer copies have been published.

Why the impact is the smoothest part of the curbstone today.

It is not just that Liebeler knew Tague had taken pictures. He actually thought that he had a print from that movie. I suppose he was referring to Underwood's.

In all cases Tague describes a fresh mark he says is obviously a bullet mark. This is to say not a smear.

On juch clearer version is in Denson's Destiny In Dallas, p. 4. Dillard's.

All you have to do is compare this with what Shaneyfelt came up with. It is then very obviously exactly what I said, that Shaneyfelt deliberately overexposed to hide.

A special form of art.

Remember, the Denson version is printed, which reduces clarity.

Hastily,